

o8. The Use of Cohesion Elements in the Written Expressions of Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language¹

Gökçen TEKİN² & Elif Kübra ŞİMŞEK³ & Hayriye Hande DOMAÇ⁴

APA: Tekin, G. & Şimşek, E. K. & Domaç, H. H. (2026). The Use of Cohesion Elements in the Written Expressions of Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (53), 140-159. **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21652802>

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the use of cohesion elements by intermediate (B1) and advanced (C1) learners of Turkish as a foreign language and to examine differences between proficiency levels. The study was designed according to the comparative survey model. The study group consisted of 32 B1- and 32 C1-level students studying at BAİBU University TÖMER, selected through purposive sampling. Participants' written narrative texts were examined in terms of cohesion, focusing on reference and conjunction elements. Qualitative data were analyzed using MAXQDA 24.9, whereas quantitative analyses were conducted using SPSS 20. Descriptive statistics and Mann–Whitney U tests were used to examine differences between groups. To reduce the risk of Type I error, a Bonferroni correction was applied. The findings revealed that C1-level learners used conjunction and reference elements more frequently and more diversely than B1-level learners. After the Bonferroni correction, statistically significant differences were found only in the use of time indicators and cause–effect indicators among conjunction elements, and reflexive pronouns and demonstrative adjectives among reference elements, with the C1 group outperforming the B1 group. Although ranking indicators, condition indicators, explanation indicators, effect–cause indicators, and demonstrative pronouns showed significant differences under the conventional significance criterion, these differences did not remain significant after the Bonferroni correction. Overall, the findings suggest that higher language proficiency is associated with a broader and more varied use of cohesion elements; however, the development of cohesion does not occur uniformly across all

¹ **Statement (Thesis / Paper):** It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation process of this study and all the studies utilised are indicated in the bibliography.

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest is declared.

Funding: No external funding was used to support this research.

Copyright & Licence: The authors own the copyright of their work published in the journal and their work is published under the CC BY-NC 4.0 licence.

Ethics Approval: This study does not need ethics approval.

Source: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation of this study and all the studies used are stated in the bibliography.

Similarity Report: Received – Turnitin /Ithenticate, Rate: 16%

Ethics Complaint: editor@rumelide.com

Article Type: Research article, **Article Registration Date:** 30.05.2026-**Acceptance Date:** 22.07.2026-

Publication Date: 23.07.2026; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21652802>

Peer Review: Two External Referees / Double Blind

² (50 %) Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Bölümü, Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı / Assist. Prof., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education, Division of Turkish Education (Bolu, Türkiye) **e-posta:** gokcentekinbrs@gmail.com **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6956-1207> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/01x1kqx83>

³ (30 %) Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Bölümü, Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı / Master's Student, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Graduate Education Institute, Division of Turkish Education (Bolu, Türkiye) **e-posta:** elifkubrasimseki@gmail.com **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8610-0237> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/01x1kqx83>

⁴ (20 %) Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Bölümü, Türkçe Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı / Master's Student, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Graduate Education Institute, Division of Turkish Education (Bolu, Türkiye) **e-posta:** domac9827@gmail.com **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9077-7223> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/01x1kqx83>

cohesion categories.

Keywords: Teaching Turkish as a foreign language, writing skills, cohesion

Türkçeyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenenlerin Yazılı Anlatımlarında Bağdaşıklık Unsurlarının Kullanımı⁵

Öz

Bu araştırma, Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen orta (B1) ve ileri düzey (C1) öğrencilerin bağdaşıklık öğelerini kullanım durumlarını belirlemeyi ve yeterlik düzeyleri arasındaki farklılıkları incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Araştırma, karşılaştırmalı tarama modeline göre desenlenmiştir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, amaçlı örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilen BAİBU Üniversitesi TÖMER’de öğrenim gören 32 B1 ve 32 C1 düzeyindeki öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Katılımcıların yazılı öyküleyici metinleri bağdaşıklık açısından incelenmiş; araştırma gönderim ve bağlama öğeleriyle sınırlandırılmıştır. Nitel veriler MAXQDA 24.9 programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiş, nicel analizler ise SPSS 20 programı aracılığıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Gruplar arasındaki farklılıkları incelemek amacıyla betimsel istatistikler ve Mann–Whitney U testi kullanılmıştır. Tip I hata riskini azaltmak amacıyla Bonferroni düzeltmesi uygulanmıştır. Araştırma bulguları, C1 düzeyindeki öğrencilerin bağlama ve gönderim öğelerini B1 düzeyindeki öğrencilere göre daha sık ve daha çeşitli kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Bonferroni düzeltmesi sonrasında, bağlama öğeleri arasında yalnızca zaman bildiren öğeler ile neden–sonuç bildiren öğelerin kullanımında; gönderim öğeleri arasında ise dönüşlülük zamiri ve işaret sıfatlarının kullanımında C1 grubu lehine istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Sıralama, koşul, açıklama ve sonuç–neden bildiren öğeler ile işaret zamirleri kullanımında geleneksel anlamlılık ölçütüne göre anlamlı farklılıklar görülmüş olsa da bu farklılıklar Bonferroni düzeltmesinden sonra anlamlılığını korumamıştır. Genel olarak bulgular, dil yeterliğindeki artışın bağdaşıklık öğelerinin daha geniş ve çeşitli kullanımını desteklediğini; ancak bağdaşıklığın tüm alt kategorilerinde gelişimin aynı biçimde gerçekleşmediğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi, yazma becerisi, bağdaşıklık

⁵ **Beyan (Tez/ Bildiri):** Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.
Çıkar Çatışması: Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman: Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.
Telif Hakkı & Lisans: Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.
Etik İzni: Bu çalışma etik izin gerektirmemektedir.
Kaynak: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.
Benzerlik Raporu: Alındı – Turnitin / İthenticate / İntihal, Oran: %16
Etik Şikayeti: editor@rumelide.com
Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi, **Makale Kayıt Tarihi:** 30.05.2026-**Kabul Tarihi:** 22.07.2026-**Yayın Tarihi:** 23.07.2026; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21652802>

Introduction

Writing skill

Writing skills enable individuals to express their thoughts and feelings in accordance with the rules of a language (Karatay, 2020). As one of the productive language skills, writing addresses a reader within a particular context and requires the integration of cognitive, linguistic, and rhetorical processes (Bachman, 1990; Bitzer, 1968; Matsuda & Silva, 2020). Because it involves generating, organizing, and communicating ideas through written language, writing is widely regarded as one of the most demanding language skills (Arslan & Kılıc, 2015; Byrne, 1993; Çakır, 2010; Kırış, 2022; Movlyamova & Özdemir, 2022; Raimes, 2002; Süğümlü & Bakdemir, 2023; Tiryaki, 2013).

Effective writing requires much more than producing grammatically correct sentences. Writers must organize ideas logically, establish meaningful relationships between sentences, and construct a coherent text that communicates effectively with the reader (Byrne, 1993; Raimes, 2002; Richards, 1990). Although writing requires sufficient grammatical knowledge and vocabulary, these alone are not enough for effective writing, as writing involves much more than producing grammatically correct sentences. As a natural human need, writing not only develops language knowledge and vocabulary but also enables individuals to establish a continuous relationship with language and to use it beyond basic communication (Emig, 1977). It also supports idea generation and helps learners explore different ways of expressing their thoughts (Zamel, 1983). Despite being neglected for many years (Zen, 2005), writing has long been recognized as a complementary (Castain, 1976), integrative and functional (Raimes, 1983), as well as organic and cognitive (Javadi-Safa, 2018) component of language learning. Because writing requires deep processing, it also contributes to the development and maintenance of receptive language skills and can be regarded as an effective learning strategy (Castain, 1976; Emig, 1977).

Writing is a multifaceted skill involving the interaction of the writer, the reader, and the communicative context, while requiring the use of appropriate strategies for generating and conveying ideas as well as effective textual organization (Matsuda & Silva, 2020). It also encompasses multiple components, including content, organization, originality, style, fluency, accuracy, and appropriate rhetorical forms of discourse (Raimes, 2002). Therefore, successful writing depends on the effective integration of these components to produce clear and meaningful texts.

Writing skills in a foreign language

Although writing requires a strong command of grammar and vocabulary, these alone are not sufficient for effective writing. Learning to write is considered one of the most demanding language skills in both first and foreign language contexts and is often regarded as an indicator of successful learning as well as a means of learning (Richards, 1990). Unlike speaking, which develops naturally under normal conditions, writing requires explicit instruction and systematic practice (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). It involves complex processes such as planning, drafting, revising, and organizing ideas (Brown, 2000), making writing instruction particularly important for foreign language learners (Zamel, 1976). Effective written expression also requires mastery of structures that are less common in everyday communication but essential for written discourse (Byrne, 1993). Therefore, writing instruction should be integrated into language education through conscious and sustained practice (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

Previous research has shown that writing in a foreign language presents greater challenges than writing

in the first language (Azizoğlu et al., 2019; Çakır, 2010; Karatay & Kartallıoğlu, 2016; Özçelik, 2020; Raimes, 2002). As the last productive language skill to develop, writing depends on learners' linguistic competence and requires the integration of content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics (Özbay & Memiş, 2015; Raimes, 1983; Ungan, 2007;). In addition, the absence of immediate feedback makes writing a particularly demanding activity (Byrne, 1993). Nevertheless, effective writing instruction contributes not only to language development but also to higher-order skills such as critical thinking, autonomy, creativity, and self-confidence (Smetanová, 2013; Zamel, 1976).

Producing coherent written texts in a foreign language primarily depends on learners' command of the language's grammar, vocabulary, and orthographic system (Anwar & Ahmed, 2016). However, grammatical knowledge alone does not guarantee successful text production. Students must also learn to organize sentences into meaningful and coherent texts by using textual features appropriately. Therefore, writing instruction should emphasize the development of textuality from the early stages of language learning through a process-oriented approach that focuses on both the writing process and the final product.

Theoretical Framework

Text

A text is a verbal or written unit of meaning that constitutes a whole regardless of its length. However, a text becomes a semantic structure not merely through the sentences that compose it but through the meaningful relationships established among them (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Although texts vary in length and type, they achieve unity through semantic connections across sentences (Altunkaya, 1987). According to Bachman (1990), organizational competence includes grammatical and textual competence, with textual competence referring to the ability to organize words and sentences into coherent and rhetorically appropriate discourse. From a broader perspective, a text can also be viewed as a reflection of human consciousness, and understanding a text involves interpreting this reflection through the reader's cognitive processes (Bakhtin, 1986).

A text is a syntactic and semantic unit beyond the sentence in which meaning is constructed through the interaction between the writer and the reader (Hirik, 2020). It constitutes a meaningful whole formed by the combination of words and sentences (Karatay, 2010) and is defined by the Turkish Language Association as a written product characterized by its content, style, and orthographic features (Türk Dil Kurumu, 2025). Texts are produced for a specific communicative purpose and achieve unity through the principles of cohesion and coherence (Onursal, 2003). Accordingly, De Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) argue that a text fulfills its communicative function only when it satisfies the seven criteria of textuality.

Criteria for textuality

Intentionality

This can be described as a text conveying its main purpose in accordance with its defined goal. Kılıç (2007) states that intentionality in a text is demonstrated by establishing a natural chronological order, being related, and being concise and clear.

Acceptability

This is the characteristic of a text that meets the expected requirements of usefulness, relevance, and consistency (Kılıç, 2007). Acceptability is a criterion of textuality that is more related to the large-scale structure of the text and involves the reader in understanding and interpretation (Çetin & Karademir, 2023). Günay (2007), on the other hand, states that texts should be perceived within their own formal ambiguities.

Informativeness

Informativeness, which is related to the degree to which the elements in the text are expected, known, and certain (Kılıç, 2007); being informative for the reader (Yılmaz, 2021); It is related to what the reader expects and what they want to know, and what they are addressed with (Tekin & Kaya, 2024). The level of informativeness of the text is twofold; it can vary depending on both the reader's prior knowledge and the vocabulary and style used by the text producer (Çetin & Karademir, 2023).

Situationality

Situationality, meaning that the text is appropriate to its textual context (Yılmaz, 2021), is a criterion of textuality used in interpreting a written text and expresses the clarity of the discourse in terms of concepts such as time and space (Çetin & Karademir, 2023). It concerns the elements that reveal the dimension of the relationship between a text and the situation in which it is located, and that connect the text to that situation (Kılıç, 2007).

Intertextuality

In its most general sense, intertextuality, which is the inclusion of one text within another text (Bulut, 2018), is related to the necessity of having knowledge of one or more previously existing texts in determining the meaning or use of a text (Çetin & Karademir, 2023). The wider the time and processing activities between the use of the current text and previously encountered texts, the greater the mediation becomes (De Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002).

Coherence

Coherence, which can be considered as the meaning conveyed by the expressions in the text (De Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002), is actually in the eye of the reader (Hyland, 2005). Coherence is the situation where each text is logical and contextual rather than a jumble of sentences, based on the assumption that what is mentioned is consistent with each other (Kılıç, 2007). If coherence is achieved, the unity and integrity in the text can create meaning in the mind (Karatay, 2010).

Cohesion

Cohesion, which deals with how the components of the surface text, i.e., words, are mutually related within a series, is linked to each other according to grammatical forms and rules (De Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002). Günay (2007) also defines it as the totality of a text's linguistic features in its intratextual relationships. The concept of cohesion is a semantic relationship within the text that defines it as a text. Cohesion is the act of relating something to what already exists, and it arises when the interpretation of one element in discourse depends on the interpretation of another. Like other semantic

relationships, cohesion is expressed through the layered organization of language (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion encompasses the linguistic relationships found in the surface structure of the text and is divided into two main categories: grammatical cohesion, which consists of reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, and lexical cohesion:

Grammatical Cohesion

Reference

Reference is the situation where a word, group of words, or suffix is used to represent a concept, entity, or event in the text, instead of repeating that word or event throughout the rest of the text. Reference is divided into two types: antecedent and postcedent. In these types of references, linguistic tools such as pronouns of person, relation, sign, and reflexivity, along with appropriate suffixes, demonstrative adjectives, or adverbs, are generally used (Karatay, 2010). In every language, there are elements whose interpretation depends on another reference, rather than being interpreted semantically on their own. Reference is a presupposition at the semantic level. As a situational presupposition, reference is regularly used in textual (endophoric) presuppositions; it sometimes points forward (cataphoric) and sometimes backward (anaphoric). In many forms of discourse, reference is textual. These elements serve as guidelines indicating that information about them must be obtained elsewhere (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Substitution

Substitution, seen at the noun, verb, or sentence level in the text, is the expression of the specified elements in another sentence using a different linguistic element (Karatay, 2010). In short, substitution is the replacement of one element with another. There is a difference in expression rather than a change in meaning. Substitution, also called replacement, is the use of one element in place of another to replace a specific element (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Ellipsis (Elliptical expression)

This refers to the omission of certain words or word groups in a text without altering the meaning of the text. Elliptical expression can be achieved through pronouns, demonstrative adjectives, and adverbs of place and time; it can also be created by removing certain words or word groups with various functions from the sentence (Karatay, 2010). It can be interpreted as a form of substitution in which the element is not replaced by anything else. Ellipsis generally involves an anaphoric relationship in which the omitted element can be recovered from the preceding text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Conjunction elements

Words, word groups, and sentences are the basic structures that make up language. Conjunction elements are among the most important elements that establish relationships between these structures (Demir et al., 2024). Conjunctions are classified as discriminative, additive, indicating time, adversative, explanation, ranking, condition, assumption, exemplifying, and cause-effect and effect-cause. Conjunction elements are consistent not on their own, but indirectly, thanks to their specific meanings; they are not tools used to reach the previous or subsequent text; they express specific meanings that acknowledge the existence of other components in the discourse (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Lexical cohesion

This refers to the use of words that represent the same conceptual field within the text (Tekin & Kaya, 2024). It is formed by repeating the same word or by repeating related words.

Research objectives and research questions

Students' written expressions are products of a skill that allows them to convey their feelings and thoughts in writing. However, the effective and complete production of these works depends on the extent to which the target language has been learned, the proficiency of writing skills, and the accumulation of knowledge and skills related to the target language. Therefore, it is known that the process of learning writing skills in a foreign language differs from that in native language education and presents difficulties across various dimensions (Azizoğlu et al., 2019; Çakır, 2010; Karatay & Kartalhoğlu, 2016; Özçelik, 2020; Raimes, 2002). There are existing studies focusing on cohesion in writing skills research in teaching Turkish as a foreign language (Aramak, 2016; Deniz & Daşöz, 2015; Dolunay & Manti, 2018; Ercan Güven & Akpınar, 2020; Ercan Güven & Akpınar, 2020; Gürdal & Çetin, 2015; Kara & Kutlu, 2016; Karakoç Öztürk & Dağıstanlıoğlu, 2018; Manti, 2017; Mısırlı, 2018; Yıldırım, 2016; Öztürk & Alan, 2020; Tekin & Kaya, 2024) and studies that address coherence and cohesion together (Akbulut, 2021). Although cohesion consists of several grammatical and lexical devices (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), the present study focuses specifically on reference and conjunction elements because these categories play a central role in establishing semantic and logical relationships within a text and maintaining textual continuity. Additionally, they are expected to better reflect differences in cohesion use across proficiency levels, while the Cohesion and Coherence Measurement Tool (Karatay, 2010) and the coding framework developed by Karatay and Kaya (2019) provide detailed and systematic classification criteria for these two categories, enabling a reliable comparative analysis. Accordingly, this study contributes to the literature by providing a statistical comparison of the use of reference and conjunction elements across B1 and C1 proficiency levels. In doing so, it identifies both the cohesion categories that differ across proficiency levels and those that exhibit similar usage patterns, thereby offering a more detailed understanding of the development of cohesion in the written production of learners of Turkish as a foreign language. By identifying cohesion usage patterns across different levels of written expression, the study aims to provide practical implications for improving the textual dimension of writing instruction. It is hoped that the findings will contribute to researchers and practitioners working in the field of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. The main objective of the study is to examine and compare the use of reference and conjunction elements in the written texts of intermediate (B1) and advanced (C1) learners of Turkish as a foreign language. The research questions developed based on this objective are as follows:

1. What are the usage patterns of conjunction elements in the written texts of B1- and C1-level learners of Turkish as a foreign language?
2. What are the usage patterns of reference elements in the written texts of B1- and C1-level learners of Turkish as a foreign language?
3. Is there a significant difference between B1- and C1-level learners of Turkish as a foreign language in their use of conjunction elements?
4. Is there a significant difference between B1- and C1-level learners of Turkish as a foreign

language in their use of reference elements?

Method

This research was designed according to the comparative survey model. Survey research is a research model that identifies participants' skills, thoughts, attitudes, abilities, and other characteristics related to a situation (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015). The comparative survey model, a type of cross-sectional survey research, examines two or more educational groups by comparing them on various characteristics (Creswell, 2020). Thirty-two B1 and 32 C1 level students studying at University TÖMER participated in this research. The participants' written narrative texts were examined for their use of cohesion. The study was limited to the cohesion elements of reference and conjunction elements. Reference and conjunction elements are considered among the cohesion devices that perform important functions in establishing intra-textual relations and maintaining semantic continuity. Therefore, the present study focused on these elements. Conjunction elements not present in participants' written narrative texts were excluded from the analysis.

Study group

The study group consisted of 64 students enrolled in the 2024-2025 academic year at BAİBU University TÖMER, comprising 32 B1 and 32 C1 level students. Purposive sampling was used to determine the study group for the research. In this method, the researcher selects groups he/she believes can provide data for the research in an appropriate manner, based on his/her prior knowledge of the groups, and conducts the research on these groups (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Data collection tools

In this study, the Cohesion and Coherence Measurement Tool developed by Karatay (2010) and the written expression texts of 32 B1- and 32 C1-level learners studying at University TÖMER were used as data collection tools. The written texts were obtained from the writing section of the end-of-level achievement examinations. B1-level learners completed a writing task on the job application process, whereas C1-level learners wrote on the topic of time management. Students were instructed to write a coherent and well-organized text on the assigned topic by expressing their ideas clearly and meaningfully. No word limit was imposed, and they were given 60 minutes to complete the writing task under standard examination conditions.

The Cohesion and Coherence Measurement Tool classifies students' written expression performance into three equal intervals: 1.0–1.4 (weak), 1.5–2.4 (moderate), and 2.5–3.0 (good). Accordingly, students scoring between 1.0 and 1.4 in the use of cohesion devices and semantic coherence were evaluated as weak, those scoring between 1.5 and 2.4 as moderate, and those scoring between 2.5 and 3.0 as good. The assessment was conducted based on the textuality criteria proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), with particular emphasis on the use of cohesion devices, including reference and conjunction (Karatay, 2010). Owing to its more detailed categorization of cohesion devices during the coding process, the framework proposed by Karatay and Kaya (2019) was adopted for data coding.

Data collection technique

The data for this study consisted of previously written narrative texts produced by the students. These documents were analyzed using the Cohesion and Coherence Measurement Tool (Karatay, 2010). The

data were collected through document analysis.

Data analysis

Content analysis was used to analyze the research data. Content analysis is a technique in which certain words in the text are summarized into categories using specific codes (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015). The coding of the written texts was conducted by a single researcher using the coding framework proposed by Karatay and Kaya (2019). Throughout the analysis process, all texts were systematically coded according to predefined coding criteria to ensure consistency. However, since the coding was carried out by a single researcher, inter-rater reliability could not be established. This should be acknowledged as a limitation of the study, and future research may strengthen the reliability of findings by involving multiple independent coders and reporting inter-rater agreement statistics.

Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative data analysis for the research was performed using MAXQDA 24.9. MAXQDA is a powerful tool capable of performing complex text analyses (Creswell, 2020). The elements of reference (personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adjectives, comparison elements) and conjunction elements (additive, discriminative, adversative conjunction, time, ranking, conditional, explanation, exemplifying, cause-effect, effect-cause indicators) in the students' written expression texts were identified, and categories and subcategories were created for each element in the program. The elements identified on the papers were marked and assigned to the relevant categories. After the assignment process was completed, frequencies were obtained. MAXQDA was used only for coding and organizing cohesion devices.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis was performed using SPSS 20. Following the qualitative coding of the written texts, the frequencies of reference and conjunction elements identified in each text were entered into the statistical software for analysis. Descriptive statistics, including the number of uses, mean frequency, percentage of use, and mean levels of use for the reference and conjunction elements, were first calculated. Subsequently, the mean levels of use of these cohesion devices were compared between the B1- and C1-level learners. Prior to the comparison, the normality of the data distribution was examined. Based on the normality results, the Mann–Whitney U test, a non-parametric statistical procedure, was employed to compare the two groups because the data did not meet the assumption of normality. The results of the normality analyses are presented in the following tables.

To examine the differences between B1- and C1-level students in their use of conjunction and reference cohesion devices, the Mann–Whitney U test was employed, as it is appropriate for ordinal data. To control for the potential effect of tied ranks on the standard asymptotic p values obtained from the Mann–Whitney U test, Monte Carlo simulation (10,000 replications) was used, and the Monte Carlo p values were interpreted.

Since a total of 15 analyses were conducted for the 15 variables examined in the study, a Bonferroni correction was applied to reduce the risk of Type I error resulting from multiple comparisons. Accordingly, the adjusted significance threshold was set at $\alpha = .05/15 = .0033$. Based on the Bonferroni correction, a p value lower than .0033 was considered to indicate a statistically significant difference between the groups, whereas a p value greater than .0033 was interpreted as indicating no statistically

significant difference. It should also be noted that p values in statistical analyses are influenced not only by the magnitude of differences between groups but also by sample size, with larger samples tending to produce smaller p values. Furthermore, when a large number of multiple comparisons are conducted, the Bonferroni correction may be overly conservative, thereby reducing the likelihood of detecting statistically significant differences (Field, 2018). Given that the present study was based on a relatively small sample of 64 participants and involved 15 between-group comparisons, interpreting the Mann–Whitney U test results both with and without the Bonferroni correction may provide a more informative and balanced statistical evaluation.

Findings

The first research question

To answer this research question, the usage counts, averages, percentages, and level averages of B1 and C1 level students learning Turkish as a foreign language were descriptively analyzed to determine their usage of conjunction elements.

Table 1 Frequency of Conjunction Elements Use Among Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language at the B1–C1 Levels

Conjunction Elements	Level	n	Usage Count	Usage Average (X)	Usage Percentage (%)	Usage Level (X)	Level	n	Usage Count	Usage Average (X)	Usage Percentage (%)	Usage Level (X)
Additive	B1	29	192	6	51.78	2.34	C1	32	389	12.15	53.95	2.56
Discriminative Conjunction	B1	8	16	0.5	4.3	0.37	C1	10	14	.43	1.94	0.34
Adversative Conjunction	B1	22	55	1.71	14.8	0.96	C1	17	59	1.84	8.18	0.62
Time Indicator	B1	1	1	.03	.27	0.06	C1	18	30	.93	4.16	0.56
Ranking Indicator	B1	3	3	.09	.81	0.06	C1	12	17	.53	2.36	0.37
Condition Indicator	B1	4	5	.15	1.35	0.12	C1	15	53	1.65	7.35	0.50
Explanation Indicator	B1	2	5	.15	1.35	0.06	C1	10	25	.78	3.47	0.34
Exemplifying Indicator	B1	9	22	.68	5.93	0.40	C1	10	11	.34	1.53	0.31
Cause-Effect Indicator	B1	6	8	.25	2.16	0.31	C1	23	48	1.50	6.66	0.81
Effect-Cause Indicator	B1	11	64	2	17.25	0.50	C1	23	75	2.34	10.4	0.87
Total	B1	95	371	11.56	100	5.18	C1	170	721	22.5	100	7.28

The findings in Table 1 reveal clear differences across proficiency levels in students' use of conjunctions.

Students at the B1 level produced a total of 371 conjunctions, with most uses concentrated in additive conjunctions (51.78%), effect-cause indicators (17.25%), and adversative conjunctions (14.8%). In contrast, students at the C1 level produced 721 conjunctions, indicating a substantially higher frequency of conjunction use overall. Although additive conjunctions remained the most frequently used category (53.95%), condition indicators (7.35%), cause-effect indicators (6.66%), explanation indicators (3.47%), time indicators (4.16%), and ranking indicators (2.36%) were used more frequently at the C1 level than at the B1 level. While B1 learners tended to rely on a limited number of highly frequent conjunction types, C1 learners employed conjunctions more diversely to establish time, causal, explanatory, conditional, and ranking relationships within their texts. For example, time indicators were represented by expressions such as *şu anda* ("at the moment") in the sentence "*Şu anda Türkiye'nin Bolu şehrinde üniversite eğitimime devam ediyorum.*"; conditional indicators by *eğer* ("if") in "*Eğer ben işsiz olsaydım, bu fırsatı kabul etmeyecektim.*"; and effect-cause indicators by *sonuç olarak* ("as a result") in "*Sonuç olarak, zaman yönetimi bireyin yaşam kalitesini artıran önemli bir beceridir.*" These findings suggest that learners at higher proficiency levels demonstrate not only a greater quantity of conjunction use but also a broader distribution of conjunction categories.

The second research question

To answer this research question, the usage counts, averages, percentages, and level averages of B1 and C1 level students learning Turkish as a foreign language were descriptively analyzed to determine their usage of reference elements.

Table 2 Frequency of Reference Elements Use Among Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language at The B1–C1 Levels

Reference Elements	Level	n	Usage Count	Usage Average (X)	Usage Percentage (%)	Usage Level (X)	Level	n	Usage Count	Usage Average (X)	Usage Percentage (%)	Usage Level (X)
Personal Pronoun	B1	25	155	4.84	64.32	1.65	C1	26	183	5.71	34.40	1.43
Reflexive Pronoun	B1	6	8	.25	3.32	0.31	C1	21	51	1.59	9.59	0.71
Demonstrative Pronoun	B1	16	19	.59	7.88	0.43	C1	21	58	1.81	10.90	0.81
Demonstrative Adjective	B1	4	10	.31	4.15	0.13	C1	29	116	3.6	21.80	1.28
Comparison Elements	B1	17	49	1.53	20.33	0.87	C1	30	124	3.87	23.31	1.03
Total	B1	68	241	7.52	100	3.39	C1	99	532	16.58	100	5.26

The findings presented in Table 2 indicate differences between B1- and C1-level learners in the use of reference elements. At the B1 level, students produced a total of 241 reference elements, with personal pronouns representing the largest proportion (64.32%). Comparison elements (20.33%) and demonstrative pronouns (7.88%) followed, whereas demonstrative adjectives (4.15%) and reflexive pronouns (3.32%) were used less frequently. At the C1 level, learners produced a total of 532 reference elements. Personal pronouns remained the most frequently used reference element (34.40%), followed by comparison elements (23.31%), demonstrative adjectives (21.80%), demonstrative pronouns

(10.90%), and reflexive pronouns (9.59%). Compared with the B1 level, the frequency of use was higher across all categories at the C1 level. For example, the reflexive pronoun *kendilerini* ("themselves") in the sentence "*İş başvurusu süreci, bireylerin kendilerini değerlendirmelerine ve fark etmelerine zaman tanır.*" and the demonstrative adjective *o* ("that") in "*O kural değiştirilmeli.*" illustrate two types of reference elements identified in the learners' texts. These findings suggest that learners at higher proficiency levels employ a broader range of reference elements and demonstrate greater diversity in establishing textual cohesion.

The third research question

To answer this research question, level averages were compared to determine whether there was a significant difference in the level of use of conjunction elements between B1 and C1 level students learning Turkish as a foreign language.

Table 3 Mann–Whitney U Test Results for Differences Between the B1 and C1 Groups in the Use of Conjunction Elements

Variable	Level	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Additive	B1	31.78	1017.00	489.00	0.706	0.047
	C1	33.22	1063.00			
Discriminative Conjunction	B1	31.34	1003.00	475.00	0.583	0.078
	C1	33.66	1077.00			
Adversative Conjunction	B1	35.52	1136.50	415.50	0.166	0.176
	C1	29.48	943.50			
Time Indicator	B1	24.28	777.00	249.00	< 0.001**	0.556
	C1	40.72	1303.00			
Ranking Indicator	B1	27.50	880.00	352.00	0.005*	0.375
	C1	37.50	1200.00			
Condition Indicator	B1	26.94	862.00	334.00	0.004*	0.376
	C1	38.06	1218.00			
Explanation Indicator	B1	28.47	911.00	383.00	0.019*	0.320
	C1	36.53	1169.00			
Exemplifying Indicator	B1	32.47	1039.00	511.00	1.000	0.002
	C1	32.53	1041.00			
Cause-Effect Indicator	B1	24.56	786.00	258.00	< 0.001**	0.480
	C1	40.44	1294.00			
Effect-Cause Indicator	B1	26.75	856.00	328.00	0.006*	0.341
	C1	38.25	1224.00			

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.0033$

The results of the Mann–Whitney U tests showed that, among the conjunction elements, the C1 group obtained significantly higher scores than the B1 group for time indicators ($p < .001$) and cause–effect conjunctions ($p < .001$), and these differences remained statistically significant even after the Bonferroni correction. In contrast, for ranking indicator ($p = .005$), condition indicator ($p = .004$), explanation

indicator ($p = .019$), and effect-cause indicator ($p = .006$), the C1 group also scored higher than the B1 group. However, these differences were statistically significant only before the Bonferroni correction and were no longer considered statistically significant after the correction was applied.

The effect size of the Mann–Whitney U test was evaluated using the r coefficient. According to Cohen (1988), r values between .10 and .30 indicate a small effect, values between .30 and .50 indicate a medium effect, and values greater than .50 indicate a large effect. Accordingly, as shown in Table 1, the significant differences between the groups in terms of conjunction elements can be interpreted as ranging from medium to large effect sizes.

The fourth research question

To answer this research question, level averages were compared to determine whether there was a significant difference in the level of use of reference elements between B1 and C1 level students learning Turkish as a foreign language.

Table 4 Mann–Whitney U Test Results for Differences Between the B1 and C1 Groups in the Use of Reference Elements

Variable	Level	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p	r
Personal Pronoun	B1	34.19	1094.00	458.00	0.469	0.095
	C1	30.81	986.00			
Reflexive Pronoun	B1	26.41	845.00	317.00	0.003**	0.371
	C1	38.59	1235.00			
Demonstrative Pronoun	B1	27.50	880.00	352.00	0.019*	0.299
	C1	37.50	1200.00			
Demonstrative Adjective	B1	19.44	622.00	94.00	< 0.001**	0.769
	C1	45.56	1458.00			
Comparison Elements	B1	30.50	976.00	448.00	0.366	0.114
	C1	34.50	1104.00			

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.0033$

The results of the Mann–Whitney U tests revealed that, among the reference elements, the C1 group obtained statistically significantly higher scores than the B1 group in the use of reflexive pronouns ($p = .0028$) and demonstrative adjectives ($p < .001$), even after the Bonferroni correction was applied. In addition, the C1 group appeared to have higher scores than the B1 group in the use of demonstrative pronouns ($p = .019$). However, although this difference was statistically significant under the conventional significance threshold, it did not remain significant after the Bonferroni correction was applied and was therefore interpreted as non-significant under the adjusted criterion. According to Table 2, the significant differences between the groups in terms of reference elements can be interpreted as ranging from medium to large effect sizes.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Suggestions

In this study, statistically significant differences were found between B1- and C1-level learners in the use of time indicators and cause–effect indicators. Among the reference elements, reflexive pronouns and demonstrative adjectives remained statistically significant after the Bonferroni correction, whereas

demonstrative pronouns reached significance only under the conventional significance criterion. In contrast, for the cohesive elements indicating addition, distinction, adversative conjunction, and example, and for the reference elements indicating personal pronouns and comparison elements, similar results were observed across groups, with no significant difference. When these findings are evaluated overall, significant differences are observed in the use of some cohesion sub-elements, while other elements exhibit a similar usage pattern. This result may suggest that language proficiency is not the sole determinant in the use of cohesion elements. While C1-level students clearly differentiated between groups with high averages in some elements, common usage tendencies were also observed in some elements. This situation suggests that the development and use of cohesion elements may be multifactorial and that levels may demonstrate their linguistic proficiency in different ways in different elements.

This pattern may indicate that higher proficiency levels are associated with greater discursive flexibility and more effective management of textual relations. This is because individuals with advanced language proficiency, skills, and experience are more likely to produce a coherent text that adheres to the writing rules of the target language (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). Although writing processes are generally similar in the native and foreign languages, this process is quite different in the foreign language. Silva (1993) states that individuals writing in a foreign language plan less and experience greater difficulty in creating and organizing their material. He also states that their texts contain more errors; their discourse has lower coherence, particularly with excessive use of conjunctions, less lexical cohesion, and limited differentiation and variety. This information supports the finding that C1-level students generally demonstrated greater variety and higher frequencies of use than B1-level students. This interpretation is also consistent with the descriptors of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). According to the CEFR, B1-level learners can “write straightforward connected texts on a range of familiar subjects within [their] field of interest, by linking a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 61). In contrast, C1-level learners can “write clear, well-structured texts on complex subjects, underlining the relevant salient issues, expanding and supporting points of view at some length with subsidiary points, reasons and relevant examples, and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 61). The greater use of time indicators, cause–effect indicators, reflexive pronouns, and demonstrative adjectives observed among C1 learners in the present study appears to be compatible with the CEFR’s expectation that advanced learners establish more elaborated and structurally organized written discourse.

C1-level students appeared to establish textual relationships through a wider use of time and cause–effect indicators. The broader range of vocabulary and connectives available to C1-level learners may facilitate the expression of meaning relationships within the text. In contrast, the lower use of these elements among B1 learners may indicate a stronger focus on sentence-level production rather than text-level organization. These findings may reflect differences in learners’ ability to use cohesion devices in more functional and varied ways at advanced proficiency levels. In addition to proficiency-related factors, foreign language anxiety may also be considered as a possible factor influencing learners’ use of cohesion devices. Previous research has shown that foreign language anxiety may increase learners’ cognitive burden and negatively influence their language performance (Kasap, 2021). Since anxiety may reduce learners’ willingness to take linguistic risks, lower-proficiency learners may tend to rely on more familiar and less complex cohesion devices rather than using a wider range of connectors. Therefore, B1 learners’ more limited variety of cohesion elements may also be interpreted in relation to affective factors, although further research is needed to examine this relationship directly.

In contrast, similar results were obtained between levels in the use of conjunctions (additives, distinctives, adversative conjunctions, and examples) and in the use of personal pronouns and comparative elements among reference elements. This may be because these cohesion elements are structures that are learned and frequently used from the earliest stages of language acquisition. Furthermore, elements such as and, but, for example, however, and for instance, as well as personal pronouns and comparative structures, are used and accepted by students in both levels and are frequently repeated in daily communication. Therefore, it is expected that learners at both proficiency levels will use these elements in similar ways. Although these cohesion devices were used more frequently by C1-level learners, the differences in their usage levels did not reach statistical significance. This finding may suggest that these devices are commonly used by both intermediate- and advanced-level learners and therefore do not clearly differentiate proficiency levels.

When reviewing the literature, Ercan Güven and Akpınar (2020) stated that the most preferred type of conjunction among B2 and C1-level students learning Turkish as a foreign language was the one indicating order. In this study, the most frequently used conjunction among students at both levels was the additive conjunction. In this sense, the results do not coincide. Aramak (2016) observed that students in the C1 level learning Turkish as a foreign language most frequently used additive and effect-cause conjunctions. The results of this study also show that additive conjunctions (53.95%) and effect-cause conjunctions were among the most frequently used conjunction types. Similarly, Deniz and Daşöz (2015) determined that foreign students at the B1 and B2 levels most frequently used conjunctions indicating "addition" and "cause" when justifying their ideas while composing Turkish texts. Karakoç Öztürk and Dağıstanlıoğlu (2018) and Yıldırım (2016) also reported that the most frequently used elements in their studies with B1-level students were connectives. The results obtained are consistent with the findings of this study in the literature. Dolunay and Mantı (2018), in their study with 100 students at the A2, B1, B2, and C1 levels, found that cohesive elements ranked second in terms of frequency of use, that cohesive elements, especially those indicating assumption, were almost never used, and that there is a need for studies aimed at reinforcing conjunctions that indicate distinction, sequence, condition, and example.

In summary, C1-level learners tended to use cohesion devices more frequently and more diversely than B1-level learners, although statistically significant differences were limited to specific conjunction and reference categories. To this end, writing instruction should be planned in accordance with textuality criteria from the early stages of language learning. The sooner students realize that a text, a written expression, is not just a sequence of sentences, the more effective and earlier this development will be. It is necessary to make students understand that linking sentences is not just about preventing discontinuity; cohesion elements are the parts that make a text a whole. The written narratives examined in this study are limited to B1 and C1 proficiency levels and to the analysis of reference and conjunction elements. In addition, the data were obtained from standardized end-of-level achievement examinations in which the writing tasks differed according to proficiency level. Specifically, B1 learners wrote on the job application process, whereas C1 learners wrote on time management. Although both tasks were designed to assess writing performance appropriate to their respective proficiency levels, differences in writing topics may have had a minor influence on the frequency and variety of cohesion devices used. Future studies may expand the scope of the research by examining developmental differences in cohesion and coherence across a wider range of proficiency levels using comparable writing tasks. Furthermore, the effect of learners' native language on cohesion may be investigated with homogeneous samples from the same linguistic background. Such studies may contribute to a better understanding of the role of cohesion in the development of writing skills.

References / Kaynakça

- Altunkaya, F. (1987). Cohesion in Turkish: A survey of cohesive devices in prose literature. (Doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Akbulut, B. (2021). Yabancılar Türkçe öğretiminde kavramsal-işlevsel izlenim ile hazırlanmış A1 düzeyindeki metinlerin bağdaşıklık, bağlaşıklık ve tutarlılık ilişkisi içinde incelenmesi. *Türk Ekini*, (8), 48-60.
- Anwar, M.N., & Ahmed, N. (2016). Students' difficulties in learning writing skills in a second language. *Science International (Lahore)*, 28(4), 735-739. <http://www.sci-int.com/pdf/636371044369572552.pdf>
- Aramak, K. (2016). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde bağdaşıklık araçlarının kullanım düzeyi üzerine bir araştırma (*Unpublished master's thesis*). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Arslan, M., & Kılıc, E. (2015). Problems in the development of writing skills in Turkish foreign language education: the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Kirikkale University Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 169-182.
- Azizoğlu, N. İ., Tolaman, T. D., & Tulumcu, F. İ. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde akademik yazma becerisi: karşılaşılan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *International Journal of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language*, 2(1), 7-22.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.). University of Texas Press.
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The Rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1 (1), pp.1-14
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Bulut, F. (2018). 'Metinlerarasılık' kavramının kuramsal çerçevesi. *Journal of Literary Criticism*, 2(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.31465/eeder.397704>
- Byrne, D. (1993). *Teaching writing skills*. Longman.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Pegem Akademi.
- Castain, K. (1976). *Developing second-language skills: theory to practice* (2nd ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: a guide for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2020). *Eğitim araştırmaları: nicel ve nitel araştırmanın planlanması, yürütülmesi ve değerlendirilmesi*. Edam.
- Çakır, İ. (2010). Yazma becerisinin kazanılması yabancı dil öğretiminde neden zordur?. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(28), 1-12.
- Çetin, İ., & Karademir, S. (2023). Öğrencilerin metin dil bilim ve metinsellik ölçütlerine yönelik görüşleri üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Bilge International Journal of Social Research*, 7(2), 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.47257/busad.1390787>
- De Beaugrande, R.A., & Dressler, W. U. (2002). *Introduction to text linguistics* (Digitally reformatted ed.). Routledge. <https://parhamti.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Introduction-to-Text-Linguistics.pdf#page=5.47>
- Demir, E., Günaydın, Y., & Deniz, K. (2024). Bağlama öğelerinin işlevleri. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 12(1), 172-195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ijla.74894>

- Deniz, K., & Daşöz, T. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin yazma becerilerinde gerekçelendirme. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, UDES, 1515-1526. <https://doi.org/.10.18298/ijlet.430>
- Dolunay, S. K., & Mantı, M. İ. (2018). Türkçe öğrenen Mısırlı öğrencilerin yazılı anlatım çalışmalarında bağdaşıklık: Kahire örneği. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 6(2), 386-419. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.403108>
- Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication*, 28 (2), 122-128. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc197716382>
- Ercan Güven, A. N., & Akpınar, Ş. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin tutarlı metin yazma düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, 22(3), 782-801. <https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.664761>
- Ercan Güven, A. N., & Akpınar, Ş. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenenlerin bağdaşıklık araçlarını kullanma düzeyinin değerlendirilmesi. *Selçuk University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, (43), 273-300. <https://doi.org/10.21497/sefad.756090>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics: North American edition*. SAGE.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (8th Edition). McGraw-Hill.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: an applied linguistic perspective*. Longman.
- Günay, D. (2007). *Metin bilgisi*. Multilingual Yayınları.
- Gürdal, N., & Çetin, M. (2015). Türkçe olimpiyatlarında deneme yarışmasına katılan Slav dillerine mensup öğrencilerin yazılı metinlerinde bağdaşıklık görünümleri. *Turkish Studies*, 10(15), 485-502. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8734>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Hirik, S. (2020). Türkçede bağdaşıklık ve bağdaşıklık unsurları: Kürk Mantolu Madonna incelemesi. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Journal of ISS*, 10(1), 221-238. <https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.732163>
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Javadi-Safa, A. (2018). A brief overview of key issues in second language writing teaching and research. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(2), 12-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.2p.15>
- Kara, M., & Kutlu, A. (2016). Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin yazılı anlatım metinlerindeki bağdaşıklık görünümleri. 21. Yüzyılda Eğitim ve Toplum, 5(15), 47-62.
- Karatay, H. (2010). Bağdaşıklık araçlarını kullanma düzeyi ile tutarlı metin yazma arasındaki ilişki. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 7(13), 373-385.
- Karatay, H. (2020). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde yazma eğitimi. In Karatay, H. (Ed.). *Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak eğitimi el kitabı* (411-471). Pegem Akademi.
- Karatay, H., & Kartalhoğlu, N. (2016). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenme tutumu ile dil becerileri edimi arasındaki ilişki. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(4), 203-214. <https://doi.org/10.11616/basbed.vi.455421>
- Karatay, H., & Kaya, S. (2019). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde bağlaçlar için çerçeve program. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, (7)4, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.29228/ijlet.37407>
- Karakoç Öztürk, B., & Dağıstanhoğlu, B. E. (2018). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin yazdıkları öyküleyici metinlerin bağdaşıklık görünümlerinin incelenmesi. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 14(1), 332-354. <https://doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.356640>
- Kılıç, V. (2007). Textual properties. *Beykent University Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 264-275.

- Kırıbiş, A. (2022). Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenlerin paragraf yazma becerileri. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ahi Evran University, Kırşehir.
- Mantı, M. İ. (2017). Türkçe öğrenen Mısırlı öğrencilerin yazılı anlatım çalışmalarında bağdaşıklık (Kahire Örneği). (Unpublished master's thesis). Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Matsuda, P., K., & Silva, T. (2020). Writing. Schmitt, N., Rodgers, P. H. M. (Ed.). An introduction to applied linguistics içinde (279-293). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.31261/TAPSLA.13742>
- Mısırlı, G. (2018). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin yazılı metinlerinde bağdaşıklık bağlantısı görünümüleri: bir durum çalışması örneği. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Ankara.
- Movlyamova, N., & Özdemir, E. D. (2022). A1-A2 seviyesinde yabancı dil olarak Türkçe yazma becerisinin gelişiminde yaratıcı yazma tekniklerinin kullanımı: Kazakistan örneği. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(24), 400-421. <https://doi.org/10.52096/usbd.6.24.24>
- Onursal, İ. (2003). Türkçe Metinlerde Bağdaşıklık ve Tutarlılık, Ayşe Kıran, Ece Korkut ve Suna Ağıldere (Eds.) *Günümüz Dilbilim Çalışmaları*. Multilingual Yayınları.
- Özbay, M., & Memiş, M. R. (2015). Learning and writing education based on brain research. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 3(2), 15-34. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.50549>
- Özçelik, N. (2020). Yabancı dil öğretimi/öğreniminde yazma becerisi edinimi. In Çeçen, S., Karacagil, Z., Tiro, A., O. (Eds.) *Current Debates on Social Sciences 5 Human Studies*. Bilgin Kültür Sanat Yayınları.
- Öztürk, J., & Alan, Y. (2020). Yabancı öğrencilerin bağdaşıklık araçlarını kullanma düzeylerinde 4+1 planlı yazma ve değerlendirme modelinin etkisi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 9(1), 293-315.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Raimes, A. (2002). Ten steps in planning a writing course and training teachers of writing. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.) *Methodology in language teaching* (306-314). Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications, *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), (657-677). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587400>
- Smetanová, E. (2013). Writing as part of foreign language acquisition. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 3375-3380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.389>
- Süğümlü, Ü., & Bakdemir, S. (2023). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde yazma becerisi sürecinin değerlendirilmesi: öğretici deneyimleri ve görüşleri. *International Journal of Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language*, 6(1), 82-100.
- Tekin, G., & Kaya, S. (2024). Dört kare yazma yönteminin Türk soylu öğrencilerin yazılı anlatımlarındaki bağdaşıklık, tutum ve kaygılarına etkisi. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, (Ö14), 616-634. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1456656>
- Tiryaki, E. N. (2013). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde yazma eğitimi. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education*, 1(1), 38-44. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.16018>
- Türk Dil Kurumu. (2025). TDK Güncel Türkçe Sözlük [Çevrimiçi sözlük]. [https://sozluk.gov.tr/\(05.05.2025\)](https://sozluk.gov.tr/(05.05.2025)).
- Ungan, S. (2007). The development and importance of writing skills. *Journal of Social Sciences Institute (Erciyes University)*, 23(2), 461-472.
- Yılmaz, E. (2021). Metinsellik ile yazınsallık kavramı ve Hasan Ali Toptaş'ın Bir Dünyanın Akşam Resmi öyküsünün metinsellik ile yazınsallık bağlamında incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 10(4), 1371-1392.
- Yıldırım, S. (2016). B1 düzeyinde Türkçe öğrenen yabancıların yazılı anlatımlarının bağdaşıklık

düzeyleri (Gazi Tömer örneđi). [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University, Ankara.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: what we can learn from research in the teaching of English. TESOL Quarterly, 10(1), 67-76. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585940>

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: six case studies. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165-187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647>

Zen, D. (2005). The process approach to ESL/EFL writing. Journal of Asia TEFL, 2(1).